

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **7 December 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-32. Claims 6, 19, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 19, 20, 21, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Copeland et al (USPub 2002/0116582, hereinafter "Copeland"). Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Challenger et al (USPub 2002/0143868, hereinafter "Challenger"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Deen et al (USPN 6,823,391, hereinafter "Deen"). Claims 8, 9, 22, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Lango et al (USPN 6,813,690, hereinafter "Lango"). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Mansour et al (USPub 2002/0111995, hereinafter "Mansour"). Claims 14 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Beshears et al (USPN 5,408,649, hereinafter "Beshears"). Claims 16 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Agrawal et al (USPub 2002/0004813, hereinafter "Agrawa"). Claims 15, 17, 24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Lau (USPub 2004/0199621, hereinafter "Lau"). Claims 18 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Copeland and Agarwalla et al (USPub 2003/0187935, hereinafter "Agarwalla"). Claims 31 and 32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 6, 19, and 28 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 6, 19, and 28 to limit the claims to tangible embodiments. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 6, 7, 19, 20, 28, and 29 were rejected as being anticipated by Copeland.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, 7, 19, 20, 28, and 29 to include allowable limitations from dependent claim 31. Dependent claim 31 has been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6, 7, 19, 20, 28, and 29 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-5, which depend upon claim 1, claims 8-18, which depend upon claim 7, claims 21-27, which depend upon claim 20, and claims 30 and 32, which depend upon claim 29, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 26 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com